



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 31, 2013

Ms. Leticia Brysch
City Clerk
City of Baytown
P.O. Box 424
Baytown, Texas 77522-0424

OR2013-01779

Dear Ms. Leticia Brysch:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 478488 (Baytown PIR No. 526).

The City of Baytown (the "city") received a request for all documents related to a specific request for a meeting regarding the city's proposed noise ordinance. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins.*

Exch., 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).


You state the submitted information consists of confidential communications made in furtherance of professional legal services rendered to the city. You state these communications were exchanged between city attorneys and outside counsel hired by the city. You further state these communications were intended to be confidential and that the confidentiality has been maintained. Based on these representations, and our review, we agree section 552.107 is applicable to the submitted information, and the city may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, the submitted information includes an e-mail sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if this e-mail sent to non-privileged parties is removed from the e-mail string in which it appears and stands alone, it is responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if this non-privileged e-mail, which we have marked, is maintained by the city separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which it appears, then the city may not withhold this non-privileged e-mail under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and

responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Kathryn R. Mattingly". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Kathryn R. Mattingly
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KRM/bhf

Ref: ID# 478488

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)